



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,787	09/24/2003	John E. Jones	247171-000381USPT	6413
41230 7590 07/21/2008 CUMMINS-ALLISON CORP. C/O NIXON PEABODY LLP 161 N. CLARK ST., 48TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60601				
EXAMINER				
VEZERIS, JAMES A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3693				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,787

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

JAMES A. VEZERIS

Art Unit

3693

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 and 61-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 and 61-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Final Action

Pre-Exam Formalities

1. Examiner acknowledges that claims 43-60 are withdrawn.
2. Examiner acknowledges that claims 61-63 are new.
3. Claims 1-42 and 61-63 are currently pending.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

4. In response to the applicant's argument that Brown does not teach, "a deposit or deposit transaction being made at a financial institution" and "generating a government-required report" and "representing at least a partial video image of each currency bill or storing the electronic data from the image scanner so that the scanned video images may be retrieved..." examiner notes that all three limitations are not from the original claims but from the amended claims and will be examined in this action.
5. In response to the applicant's argument that Official Notice was improper examiner disagrees, and will provide supporting art to provide the applicant with the foundation for the reasons behind the Official Notice.
6. In response to the applicant's argument that "currency or currency bills" are not taught in Cahill or Brown, examiner contends that a check could be considered currency. For all future examinations of this application, the examiner will review "currency" as government issued paper money, such as the United States Dollar bill.

Art Unit: 3694

7. A government-required report would be old and well known at the time of the invention as admitted by the applicant in the specification. Examiner notes that in order for the invention to generate a required report, the report must be known and obvious to generate. Therefore, the examiner considers the report admitted prior art.

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,550,671 to Brown et al. (Hereinafter "Brown") in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

Regarding Claim 1.

A method of accepting deposits of currency bills into a document processing device for crediting to a specified account, comprising:

receiving a plurality of documents associated with a deposit being made at a financial institution into an input receptacle of the document processing device, wherein the plurality of documents include at least one currency bill bearing a printed image that includes a serial number; (See Brown Fig 1A, Column 8 Lines 20-32) Examiner notes that a deposit can be seen as a down payment for a loan, mortgage, or other service at a financial institution, making the use of a register obvious; therefore it would be obvious to use the system of Brown inside the financial institution.

scanning the image of at least the serial number on each currency bill to produce electronic data; (See Column 8 Lines 20-32)

extracting the serial number of each currency bill from the electronic data; (See Column 8 Lines 20-32)

denominating each currency bill; (See Column 8 Lines 20-32)

accumulating the total value of the currency bills included in each deposit; (See Column 8 Lines 20-32)

Brown fails to teach generating a government-required report whenever the accumulated total value exceeds a prescribed value, the government-required report comprising at least an identification of the specified account at the financial institution to which the deposit is being made, the accumulated total value of the deposit, and the serial number for each currency bill included in the deposit.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches generating a government-required report whenever the accumulated total value exceeds a prescribed value, the government-required_report comprising at least an identification of the specified account at the financial institution to which the deposit is being made, the accumulated total value of the deposit, and the serial number for each currency bill included in the deposit.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the admitted prior art with the invention of Brown. There is motivation to do so because reporting what has been deposited into the register, after the set amount is reached, will allow the user to stay in accordance with government rules.

Regarding Claim 2.

The method according to claim 1, further comprising: counting a number of currency bills of each denomination included in the deposit; (See Brown Fig 4, Column 9 lines 23-45)

Brown fails to teach generating the government-required report includes generating the report to further comprise the number of currency bills of each denomination included in the deposit.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches generating the government-required report includes generating the report to further comprise the number of currency bills of each denomination included in the deposit.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the admitted prior art with the invention of Brown. There is motivation to do so because reporting what has been deposited into the register will allow the user to stay in

Art Unit: 3694

accordance with government rules.

Regarding Claim 3.

Brown fails to teach generating the government-required report further comprises generating the report to include an identification of a location of the document processing device into which the deposit was made, and an identification of a teller or customer responsible for the deposit.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches generating the government-required report further comprises generating the report to include an identification of a location of the document processing device into which the deposit was made, and an identification of a teller or customer responsible for the deposit.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the admitted prior art with the invention of Brown. There is motivation to do so because reporting what has been deposited into the register will allow the user to stay in accordance with government rules.

Regarding Claim 6.

Brown further teaches:

reading the identification of the specified account at the financial institution from a card supplied by a depositor; (See Brown column 11 lines 3-10)

storing the specified account identification with the scanned images relating to the corresponding deposit. (See Brown Column 11 Lines 21-25) Examiner notes that the scanned image is the barcode or account number taken from the image.

Regarding Claim 7.

Brown fails to further teach the prescribed value is \$10,000.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches the prescribed value is \$10,000. Examiner notes that since the report is government required, it would be known that it has to be supplied at the prescribed value of \$10,000.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the admitted prior art with the invention of Brown. There is motivation to do so because reporting what has been deposited into the register will allow the user to stay in accordance with government rules.

Regarding Claim 9.

Brown further teaches:

detecting a suspect counterfeit currency bill included in the deposit; (See Brown column 11 lines 5-16)

generating a signal indicating the detection of a suspect counterfeit bill; (See Brown column 11 lines 5-16)

retaining electronic data representing at least a portion of an image on the detected suspect counterfeit bill in association with the identification of the specified account at the financial institution. (See Brown column 11 lines 5-16)

Regarding Claim 10.

Brown teaches transporting the plurality of documents and denominating the plurality of documents occurs at a rate in excess of 800 documents per minute. Examiner notes that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to increase or decrease

the rate that documents are processed.

Regarding Claim 11.

Brown teaches transporting the plurality of documents and denominating the plurality of documents occurs at a rate in excess of 1,000 documents per minute. Examiner notes that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to increase or decrease the rate that documents are processed.

11. Claims 4, 8, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Applicant's admitted prior art, in further view of US Patent 6516078 to Yang et al. (Hereinafter "Yang")

Regarding Claim 4.

Brown fails to teach scanning further comprises scanning a complete image on at least one side of each currency bill so as to produce the electronic data,

Yang teaches scanning further comprises scanning a complete image on at least one side of each currency bill so as to produce the electronic data, (See Figure 1, Column 3 lines 4-57)

Brown fails to the further teach generating the government-required report includes generating the report to include complete images of the currency bills included in the deposit.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches generating the government-required report includes generating the report to include complete images of the currency bills included in the deposit.

It would be obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Applicant's admitted prior art, Brown, and Yang. There is motivation to do so because recalling images of past deposited currency allows for assurance that fraud can not occur.

Regarding Claim 8.

Brown fails to further teaches storing the electronic data so that images of the documents may be retrieved and displayed for review at a time subsequent to completion of the deposit.

Yang teaches storing the electronic data so that images of the documents may be retrieved and displayed for review at a time subsequent to completion of the deposit. (See Figure 1, Column 3 lines 4-57)

It would be obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Applicant's admitted prior art, Brown, and Yang. There is motivation to do so because recalling images of past deposited currency allows for assurance that fraud can not occur.

Regarding Claim 61.

Brown fails to further teach the electronic data represents at least a partial video image of each currency bill.

Yang teaches the electronic data represents at least a partial video image of each currency bill.

It would be obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Applicant's admitted prior art, Brown, and Yang. There is motivation to do so because recalling images of past deposited currency allows for assurance that fraud can not occur.

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, in further view of US Patent 5,530,773 to Thompson. (Hereinafter "Thompson")

Regarding Claim 5.

Brown fails to further teach the documents include at least one deposit slip bearing an image, and wherein scanning includes scanning the image on the deposit slip to produce the electronic data.

Thompson teaches the documents include at least one deposit slip bearing an image, and wherein scanning includes scanning the image on the deposit slip to produce the electronic data.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Brown, Applicant's admitted prior art, and Thompson. There is motivation to do so because, having a recorded deposit slip enables the system to maintain an accurate deposit amount.

Regarding Claims 12-42 and 62-63.

Claims 12-42 and 62-63 are rejected using analogous reasoning given to claims 1-11 and 61.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES A. VEZERIS whose telephone number is

(571)270-1580. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-alt. Fridays
7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JAMES A VEZERIS/
Examiner, Art Unit 3693

July 7, 2008

/James P Trammell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694